APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,224	10/18/2001	Jacobo Bibliowicz	G&C 30566.198-US-01	7407

			EXAMINER
22462	7590	05/24/2004	BONSHOCK, DENNIS G

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	4

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/982,224	BIBLIOWICZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dennis G. Bonshock	2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 October 2001*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-57* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-57* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2 and 3*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims1-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Brown et al., Patent #6,067,551, hereinafter Brown and Kumar et al., Patent

#6,342,906, hereinafter Kumar.

3.   With regard to claim 1, Brown teaches a method of collaborating users access to

a document on a network (see column 2, lines 48-65), storing a document on a server

(see column 2, lines 56-61), receiving a request, in the server, to open the document

(see column 10, lines 65 through column 11, line 3), establishing a collaboration session

where the sever permits two or more users to work simultaneously across a network on

a document stored on the server (see column 2, liens 46-65), receiving a command to

modify the document from a first user in the session (see column 3, lines 30-34), and

the server distributing the command to modify to the other ones of the collaborators in

the session (see column 4, lines 7-26). Brown, however, doesn't explicitly state that the

document being shared is a drawing document. Kumar teaches as system of

collaborating with a group of users on a project (see column 3, lines 33-51), similar to

that of Brown, but further teaches the data in the shared workspace being a drawing

document (see column 3, lines 39-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art, having the teachings of Brown and Kumar before him at the time the

invention was made to modify the collaborating system of Brown to share drawing

documents. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because

Brown states that the system can be implemented with other types of documents, where

a drawing document as used in Kumar is an obvious choice.

4.   With regard to claims 2, 21, and 40, which teach the sever maintaining a history

of modifications to the drawing document, Brown further teaches, in column 17, lines 1-

14, keeping a change history.

5.   With regard to claims 3, 14, 22, 33, 41, and 52, which teach the history being

used to support an undo command, Brown teaches, in column 15, lines 24-35, an undo

file which uses various edits (changes) of the users.

6.   With regard to claims 4, 23, and 42, which teach the history being used to re-

comunicate modifications to the two or more users, Brown further teaches, in column

17, lines 1-14, keeping a change history, which maintains the recent changes.

7.   With regard to claims 5, 16, 24, 35, 43, and 54, which teach the server

maintaining a record of the collaboration session including name, numbers, and

statuses of the two or more collaborators, Brown further teaches, in column 11, line 66

through column 12, line 8, and in figure 3, a record file for a user containing a name, a

date/time number, and a user version identifier.

8.   With regard to claims 6, 15, 25, 34, 44, and 53, which teach the command

comprising an extensible markup language XML command, Brown teaches, in column

18, lines 12-27, using a language most useful for the users' needs an purposes, where XML would be an obvious choice for this network based application.

9.   With regard to claims 7, 26, and 45, which teach two or more collaborators all having write access for the drawing document during the session, Brown further teaches, in column 5, lines 35-46, a multi-user system that provides simultaneous editing.

10.   With regard to claims 8, 17, 27, 36, 46, and 55, which teach the command being received in the server from a first collaborator pursuant to a regularly transmitted command, Brown further teaches, in column 1, lines 45-55, that the user regularly accesses common documents from the server.

11.   With regard to claims 9, 28, and 47, which teach generating an identifier for the command, Brown teaches, in column 3, lines 50-60, an identifier for a command. With regard to claim 9, further teaching distributing the identifier with the command to the other collaborators in the session, Brown further teaches, in column 4, lines 6-27, the other users using the system with the version id number.

12.   With regard to claims 10, 18, 29, 37, 48, and 56, which teach the command specifies an object identifier for an object in the drawing document that is modified, Brown further teaches, in column 4, lines 6-27, the tracking and saving of edited versions that contain id numbers.

13.   With regard to claims 11, 19, 30, 38, 49, and 57, which teach an extensible set of three dimensional modeling tools for modifying the drawing document, Kumar further

teaches, in column 3, lines 3, lines 39-51 and column 4, lines 10-24, a drawing

document with a three-dimensional view which is editable by a drawing tool.

14.   With regard to claim 12, Brown teaches a method of collaborating users access

to a document on a network (see column 2, lines 48-65), establishing a collaboration

session where the sever permits two or more users to work simultaneously across a

network on a document stored on the server (see column 2, liens 46-65), and receiving

a command to modify the document from a first user in the session (see column 3, lines

30-34). Brown, however, doesn't explicitly state that the document being shared is a

drawing document. Kumar teaches as system of collaborating with a group of users on

a project (see column 3, lines 33-51), similar to that of Brown, but further teaches the

data in the shared workspace being a drawing document (see column 3, lines 39-51). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of

Brown and Kumar before him at the time the invention was made to modify the

collaborating system of Brown to share drawing documents. One would have been

motivated to make such a combination because Brown states that the system can be

implemented with other types of documents, where a drawing document as used in

Kumar is an obvious choice.

15.   With regard to claim 13, which teaches receiving a second command to modify

the document from the server wherein the command was originally transmitted from

another collaborator, Kumar further teaches, in column 3, lines 48-51, the workspace

being kept synchronized with everyone else, by synchronization between clients

through servers.

16.   With regard to claim 20, Brown teaches, a system with a shard disk on a network and use of a shared server (see column 2, lines 46-62), a method of collaborating users access to a document on a network (see column 2, lines 48-65), a computer program stored on the server (see column 4, lines 7-11), storing a document on a server (see column 2, lines 56-61), receiving a request, in the server, to open the document (see column 10, lines 65 through column 11, line 3), establishing a collaboration session where the sever permits two or more users to work simultaneously across a network on a document stored on the server (see column 2, liens 46-65), receiving a command to modify the document from a first user in the session (see column 3, lines 30-34), and the server distributing the command to modify to the other ones of the collaborators in the session (see column 4, lines 7-26). Brown, however, doesn't explicitly state that the document being shared is a drawing document. Kumar teaches as system of collaborating with a group of users on a project (see column 3, lines 33-51), similar to that of Brown, but further teaches the data in the shared workspace being a drawing document (see column 3, lines 39-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Brown and Kumar before him at the time the invention was made to modify the collaborating system of Brown to share drawing documents. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because Brown states that the system can be implemented with other types of documents, where a drawing document as used in Kumar is an obvious choice.

17.   With regard to claim 31, Brown teaches, a system with a shard disk on a network and use of a shared server (see column 2, lines 46-62), a method of collaborating users

access to a document on a network (see column 2, lines 48-65), a computer program

stored on the server (see column 4, lines 7-11), storing a document on a server (see

column 2, lines 56-61), establishing a collaboration session where the sever permits two

or more users to work simultaneously across a network on a document stored on the

server (see column 2, liens 46-65), and receiving a command to modify the document

from a first user in the session (see column 3, lines 30-34). Brown, however, doesn't

explicitly state that the document being shared is a drawing document. Kumar teaches

as system of collaborating with a group of users on a project (see column 3, lines 33-

51), similar to that of Brown, but further teaches the data in the shared workspace being

a drawing document (see column 3, lines 39-51). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Brown and Kumar before him at the time

the invention was made to modify the collaborating system of Brown to share drawing

documents. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because

Brown states that the system can be implemented with other types of documents, where

a drawing document as used in Kumar is an obvious choice.

18.   With regard to claim 32, which teaches the computer program configured to

receive a second command to modify the document from the server wherein the

command was originally transmitted from another collaborator, Brown further teaches,

the server distributing the command to modify to the other ones of the collaborators in

the session (see column 4, lines 7-26). Kumar further teaches this limitation in column

3, lines 48-51, where he discusses the synchronization of the systems.

19.   With regard to claim 39, Brown teaches a computer readable medium which

performs a method of collaborating users access to a document on a network (see

column 2, lines 48-65), storing a document on a server (see column 2, lines 56-61),

receiving a request, in the server, to open the document (see column 10, lines 65

through column 11, line 3), establishing a collaboration session where the sever permits

two or more users to work simultaneously across a network on a document stored on

the server (see column 2, liens 46-65), receiving a command to modify the document

from a first user in the session (see column 3, lines 30-34), and the server distributing

the command to modify to the other ones of the collaborators in the session (see

column 4, lines 7-26). Brown, however, doesn't explicitly state that the document being

shared is a drawing document. Kumar teaches as system of collaborating with a group

of users on a project (see column 3, lines 33-51), similar to that of Brown, but further

teaches the data in the shared workspace being a drawing document (see column 3,

lines 39-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the

teachings of Brown and Kumar before him at the time the invention was made to modify

the collaborating system of Brown to share drawing documents. One would have been

motivated to make such a combination because Brown states that the system can be

implemented with other types of documents, where a drawing document as used in

Kumar is an obvious choice.

20.   With regard to claim 50, Brown teaches a computer readable medium which

performs a method of collaborating users access to a document on a network (see

column 2, lines 48-65), establishing a collaboration session where the sever permits two

or more users to work simultaneously across a network on a document stored on the
server (see column 2, liens 46-65), and receiving a command to modify the document
from a first user in the session (see column 3, lines 30-34). Brown, however, doesn't
explicitly state that the document being shared is a drawing document. Kumar teaches
as system of collaborating with a group of users on a project (see column 3, lines 33-
51), similar to that of Brown, but further teaches the data in the shared workspace being
a drawing document (see column 3, lines 39-51). It would have been obvious to one of
ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Brown and Kumar before him at the time
the invention was made to modify the collaborating system of Brown to share drawing
documents. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because
Brown states that the system can be implemented with other types of documents, where
a drawing document as used in Kumar is an obvious choice.

21.   With regard to claim 51, which teaches receiving a second command to modify
the document from the server wherein the command was originally transmitted from
another collaborator, Kumar further teaches, in column 3, lines 48-51, the workspace
being kept synchronized with everyone else, by synchronization between clients
through servers.

Conclusion ·

22.   The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered
pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to
consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited
therein teach systems for allowing multiple users to collaborate on a document.

23.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Dennis G. Bonshock whose telephone number is (703)

305-4668. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 6:30 a.m. - 4:00

p.m.

24.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

25.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dgb

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173